

been some discussion of the water basins, both large and small, and the fresh-water and drain-water systems of the city. One hopes that the second edition will include a description of a city other than the capital for parallels and contrasts, now that the excavations at the provincial capital Sarissa/Kusaklı have progressed to the point that distinctive features are recognizable (reports published each year in *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft*).

pp. 254f.: I fail to see how Tudhaliya IV's enormous building activities at Hattusa entailed a "concentration of resources," since by all accounts Tudhaliya was also building and renovating all over the empire. Again, this shows a prosperous kingdom with considerable surplus, and only our hindsight suggests that the king would have been prudent to use these resources massively to overfund the peacetime military.

p. 256: There is considerably more time that needs to be accounted for in the chronology given here. If we guess with Bryce that Tudhaliya IV's reign ended around 1209 (p. xi), and it seems quite clear that the empire lasted until around 1180/1175, then Tudhaliya's younger son Suppiluliuma II would appear to have had a reign of twenty to twenty-five years, not the "few years" Bryce assumes. The current excavator of Boğazköy, J. Seeherr, has suggested that perhaps the reason for the relative dearth of material related to Suppiluliuma II at Hattusa (compared to that connected with Hattusili III and Tudhaliya IV) is that Suppiluliuma may have moved the capital elsewhere, leaving an active, but diminished Hattusa.

p. 227 n. 30: For "brother" read "younger son."

None of these suggestions should imply that this is anything but a fine book. They are given in the hope that the second edition will be even better. There is nothing available which is as good on Hittite history as Professor Bryce's two books. Both are highly recommended for the expert, the student, and the interested layman. We wish them both a long life, with many future editions incorporating new discoveries.

RICHARD BEAL  
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Hattuschili und Ramses: Hethiter und Ägypter—ihr langer Weg zum Frieden.* By HORST KLENGEL.  
Mainz: PHILIPP VON ZABERN, 2002. Pp. 199, illus. €39.80.

In this time when, on one hand, an almost century-old enmity between the United States and Russia has turned into a somewhat wary friendship, and when, on the one hand, peace between Israelis and Palestinians seems ever further away, it is interesting to look at the history of a relationship between two of the Late Bronze Age's rival superpowers, the Hittites of central Anatolia (modern Turkey) and the Egyptians of the Nile valley.

Horst Klengel, Germany's leading historian of the Hittites, traces this relationship from the initial efforts by both powers to expand into Syria, through generations of hostility, a surprising offer by the widowed Egyptian queen to put a Hittite prince on the Egyptian throne (thwarted by Egyptian hawks), to the great battle of Qids (Kadesh), and eventually to a peace treaty and even a diplomatic marriage.

The book discusses the ancient sources and the problems of chronology and then the early temporary successes of Egyptian and Hittite campaigns into Syria. It unaccountably omits (p. 39) the conquest by Hittite king Tudhaliya II ("I") of much of northern Syria. It is back on track for Suppiluliuma I's seizure of northern Syria from the Mittannians, who had long been rivals of the Egyptians, but who had eventually made peace with them.

The conquest of Mittanni gave the Hittites and Egyptians a common border and so a source of constant warfare. This culminated in the showdown at Qids between Great King Muwattalli II and the young Pharaoh Ramses II. The book is tied together by a study of the peacemakers, Hittite Great King Hattušili III and Egyptian Pharaoh Ramses II, and their treaty. Klengel details the physical settings in

which each of these kings lived. We learn of the personalities and domestic and foreign problems faced by these two rulers (particularly by the usurper Hattušili) and how this pushed them into a peace treaty. There is a particularly fine description of treaty negotiations, the contents of the treaty, the divine witnesses, how the treaty physically looked on the tablets, and even speculation as to how one might affix a seal to a metal tablet.

Thanks to the preservation of a considerable number of tablets containing letters between the Hittite and Egyptian courts, Klengel is able to lay out the course of negotiations for a marriage alliance—or perhaps two—between the courts and the concerns and demands of the royal parents and of the royal bridegroom-to-be and his queen(!). What little we know of the subsequent fate of the Hittite princess is also mentioned. This is followed by several chapters concerning the peace, which lasted down to the destruction of the Hittites at the end of the Late Bronze Age.

The book is designed for the general reader and contains little new for the Hittite scholar. However, as would be expected of Klengel, the information is complete, accurate, up-to-date, and quite readable. It is also full of excellent photographs of geography, surviving architecture, close-ups of royal mummies, Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions, and tablets so clear they are readable. Much of the subject matter is out of the ordinary: I particularly like a photograph of the Hittite heartland covered in snow in May, reminding us how different the Hittite lands are from Egypt and the stereotypical Middle East.

There are of course a few problems. There is one typo: on p. 68 for Hattuschilis I, read Hattuschilis III.

It is odd that the presence of Qids on the Hittite side at the battle fought under its walls should be thought surprising (p. 63). Qids was, after all, a Hittite tributary state, albeit a difficult one. It had been conquered when Suppiluliuma I took Syria from the Mittannian empire and—not too long before the battle and after the crushing of a rebellion—had had a king, Niqmaddu, installed by Muršili II. Before the campaigns of Suppiluliuma it was very likely the southernmost tributary state of the Mittannian empire (not, as stated on p. 39, the northern border state of Egypt). Thutmose III failed to take Qids on his sixth campaign (so also Klengel, *GS*, 158), but captured it on his eighth campaign.

Qids is next mentioned in Thutmose's seventeenth campaign, when the pharaoh took a number of minor towns in its vicinity from their Mittannian garrisons. Klengel (*GS*, 159), concludes that Qids had remained loyal to Egypt and that therefore its capture was not mentioned, but I would guess that the opposite was the case. That is, after Thutmose had gone home from his eighth campaign, the Mittannians returned. On the seventeenth campaign the Mittannian garrison in the big city held out and Thutmose was only able to capture a few outlying garrisons. As Klengel himself points out (*GS*, 159), by the end of Thutmose's reign, the prince of Qids is portrayed beside those of Hatti, Crete, and Tunip, none of whom were under Egyptian control.

When Amenhotep II in his seventh year was in the vicinity with his army, the prince of Qids came to him in submission. Klengel concludes that Qids thereafter remained in the zone of Egyptian influence. Admittedly, Egyptian lists subsequently include Qids (and English kings called themselves "King of France" for many centuries after they controlled no French territory), but I think two facts show that it actually returned to Mittannian control when the Egyptian had departed. First, the rulers of Qids in the Amarna age, Šutatarra and Aitagama, appear to have names indicating some connection with the Mittannian royal dynasty. Secondly, the Hittites seem to have been loath to cross into Egyptian territory, except in retaliation or hot pursuit. Muršili II's plague prayers make no mention of Suppiluliuma taking Qids (or Amurru for that matter) from Egypt. Syrian letters of loyalty to the Egyptians in the face of Suppiluliuma's (or a neighbor's) army can be seen, at best, as a way of seeking help from their defeated overlord's ally or, at worst, as a cynical effort to play off the two superpowers against one another, and do not reflect the previous placement of the border between Egypt and Mittanni.

We really ought to refer to Hattušili III's personal goddess, the goddess of the city of Šamuḫa, as Šaušga, even if her name is usually written with the Akkadogram "Ištar," just as we do not refer to the similar Roman goddess Venus as Aphrodite. Similarly, Hattušili's father-in-law was priest of Šaušga (not Ištar—p. 102) of Lawazantiya. I seriously doubt that in southern Anatolia and northern Syria the goddess Ištar was called Hebat (p. 102), thus supposedly accounting for the priest of Šaušga giving his daughter the name Puda-Heba. As can be seen from the walls of Yazılıkaya, Hebat and Šaušga are separate goddesses, while mythological texts show them with wildly divergent personalities and functions.

Ḫebat is Teššub's wife and Šaušga is his sister. Since this is a polytheistic society, there is no reason necessarily to have all children named after the same deity.

In discussing weapons of war (p. 69), it should have been mentioned that the Hittites changed from the usual two-man chariots to three-man chariots between their battle with Pharaoh Seti I and that of Qids with Ramses II, occasioning considerable surprise among the Egyptians (see Beal, *THeth* 20, 148f.).

There are also a number of places where a useful explanatory aside is repeated in full when the subject is again mentioned, for instance that "Urchi-Teschub" was the Hurrian personal name of Muršili III (pp. 68, 73).

This is an interesting book, well recommended to that interested layman whom so many of us unfortunately ignore at the peril of the future of our field. However, even those more familiar with the material will find the presentation of such a learned author a useful refresher.

RICHARD BEAL  
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---